arXiv:1610.04639v1 [math.DS] 14 Oct 2016

INFINITE DETERMINANTAL MEASURES AND THE ERGODIC DECOMPOSITION OF INFINITE PICKRELL MEASURES II. CONVERGENCE OF DETERMINANTAL MEASURES

ALEXANDER I. BUFETOV

ABSTRACT. The second part of the paper mainly deals with convergence of infinite determinantal measures, understood as the convergence of the approximating finite determinantal measures. In addition to the usual weak topology on the space of probability measures on the space of configurations, we also consider the weak topology on the space of finite measures on the space of finite measures on the half-line, used via the natural immersion, well-defined almost surely with respect to the infinite Bessel point process, of the space of configurations into the space of finite measures on the half-line. The main results of the second part are sufficient conditions for tightness of families of determinantal measures, for convergence of sequences of induced proceses, as well as for sequences of finite-dimensional perturbations of determinantal processes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
2. Convergence of determinantal measures 2
2.1. Convergence of operators and convergence of measures 2
2.2. Convergence of induced processes 3
2.3. Application to infinite determinantal measures 6
2.4. Convergence of approximating kernels and the proof of Proposition I.1.3 7
3. Weak compactness of families of determinantal measures 10
3.1. Configurations and finite measures 10
3.2. Weak compactness and weak convergence in the space of configurations and in the space of finite measures 11
3.3. Applications to determinantal point processes 13
3.4. Induced processes corresponding to functions assuming values in $[0, 1]$ 14
3.5. Tightness for families of induced processes 15
3.6. Tightness of families of finite-rank deformations 16
3.7. Convergence of finite-rank perturbations 17
References 18

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is the second of the cycle of three papers giving the explicit construction of the ergodic decomposition of infinite Pickrell measures. Quotes to the other parts of the paper [8, 9] are organized as follows: Corollary I.1.10, equation (III.15), etc.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 studies convergence of determinantal probability measures given by positive contractions that are locally trace-class. We start by recalling that locally trace-class convergence of operators implies weak convergence of the corresponding determinantal measures in the space of probability measures on the space of configurations. In the study of infinite Pickrell measures, we need to consider induced processes of the Bessel point process as well as as finite-rank perturbations of the Bessel point process, and in Section 2 sufficient conditions are given for the convergence of induced processes and of processes induced by finite-rank perturbations. We conclude Section 2 by establishing, for infinite determinantal measures obtained as finite-rank perturbations, the convergence of the family of determinantal processes obtained by inducing on an exhausting family of subsets of the phase space to the initial, unperturbed, determinantal process.

In Section 3, we embed suitable subsets of the space of configurations into the space of *finite* measures on the phase space E and give sufficient conditions for precompactness of families of determinantal measures with respect to the weak topology on the space of finite measures on the space of *finite* measures on E (which is stronger than the usual weak topology on the space of finite measures on the space of *Radon* measures, equivalent to the weak topology on the space of finite measures on the space of configurations). This step is needed for proving the vanishing of the "Gaussian parameter" for the ergodic components of Pickrell measures. Borodin and Olshanski [5] proved this vanishing for the ergodic components of Hua-Pickrell measures: in fact, the estimate of their argument can be interpreted as the assertion of *tightness* of the family of rescaled radial parts of Hua-Pickrell measures considered as measures in the space of finite measures on the space of *finite* measures. We next study weak convergence of induced processes and of finite-rank perturbations with respect to the new topology.

2. CONVERGENCE OF DETERMINANTAL MEASURES

2.1. **Convergence of operators and convergence of measures.** We consider determinantal probability measures induced by positive contractions and start by recalling that convergence of a sequence of such operators in the

space of locally trace-class operators implies the weak convergence of corresponding determinantal probability measures in the space of finite measures on the space of configurations.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that the operators $K_n \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}\big(E,\mu\big)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}\big(E,\mu\big)$ induce determinantal probability measures $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{P}_K$ on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$. If $K_n \to K$ in $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}\big(E,\mu\big)$ as $n \to \infty$, then $\mathbb{P}_{K_n} \to \mathbb{P}_K$ with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ as $n \to \infty$.*

This proposition is immediate from the definition of determinantal probability measures and Proposition I.B.1. From the classical Heine-Mehler asymptotics (cf. Proposition I.A.3) we now have the following immediate

Corollary 2.2. *For any $s > -1$, we have*

$$\tilde{K}_n^{(s)} \to \tilde{J}_s \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}((0,+\infty),\mathrm{Leb})$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{K}_n^{(s)}} \to \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{J}_s} \text{ in } \mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}\mathrm{Conf}((0,+\infty)).$$

Our next aim is to show that, under certain additional assumptions, the convergence above persists under passage to induced processes as well as to finite-rank perturbations. We proceed to precise statements.

2.2. **Convergence of induced processes.** Recall that if Π is a projection operator acting on $L_2(E,\mu)$ and g is a nonnegative bounded measurable function on E such that the operator $1+(g-1)\Pi$ is invertible, then we have set

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi) = \sqrt{g}\Pi(1+(g-1)\Pi)^{-1}\sqrt{g}.$$

We now fix g and establish the connection between convergence of the sequence Π_n and the corresponding sequence $\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n)$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\Pi_n, \Pi \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ be orthogonal projection operators, and let $g : E \to [0,1]$ be a measurable function such that*

$$\sqrt{1-g}\Pi\sqrt{1-g} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu),\ \sqrt{1-g}\Pi_n\sqrt{1-g} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu), n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Assume furthermore that

(1) $\Pi_n \to \Pi$ *in* $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ *as* $n \to \infty$;
(2) $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{1-g}\Pi_n\sqrt{1-g} = \mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{1-g}\Pi\sqrt{1-g}$;
(3) *the operator* $1+(g-1)\Pi$ *is invertible.*

Then the operators $1+(g-1)\Pi_n$ are also invertible for all sufficiently large n, and we have

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n) \to \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi) \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n)} \to \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi)}$$

with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Remark. The second requirement could have been replaced by the requirement that $(g-1)\Pi_n$ converge to $(g-1)\Pi$ in norm, which is weaker and is what we shall actually use; nonetheless, in applications it will be more convenient to check the convergence of traces rather than the norm convergence of operators.

Proof. The first two requirements and Grümm's Theorem (see Simon [41]) imply that

$$\sqrt{1-g}\Pi_n \to \sqrt{1-g}\Pi \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_2(E,\mu),$$

whence, a fortiori,

$$(g-1)\Pi_n \to (g-1)\Pi$$

in norm as $n \to \infty$. We now take a bounded Borel subset $D \subset E$ and check that, as $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\chi_D \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n)\chi_D \to \chi_D \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi)\chi_D \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu). \tag{1}$$

Our assumptions directly imply the norm convergence

$$(1+(g-1)\Pi_n)^{-1} \to (1+(g-1)\Pi)^{-1}. \tag{2}$$

Furthermore,

$$\chi_D\Pi_n \to \chi_D\Pi$$

as $n \to \infty$ in the strong operator topology; besides, by our assumptions, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{tr} \chi_D\Pi_n\chi_D = \operatorname{tr} \chi_D\Pi\chi_D,$$

whence, by Grümm's Theorem , we have $\chi_D\Pi_n \to \chi_D\Pi$ in Hilbert-Schmidt norm, and, a fortiori, in norm.

It follows that the convergence (1) also takes place in norm. To verify the desired $\mathscr{I}_1$ convergence, by Grümm's Theorem again, it suffices to check the relation

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{tr} \chi_D\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n)\chi_D = \operatorname{tr} \chi_D\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi)\chi_D. \tag{3}$$

First, if A is a bounded operator, and $K_1, K_2 \in \mathscr{I}_2$, then one directly verifies the inequality

$$|\mathrm{tr}(K_1^* A K_2)| \leq ||K_1||_{\mathscr{I}_2} \cdot ||A|| \cdot ||K_2||_{\mathscr{I}_2}.$$

It easily follows that the function $\mathrm{tr}(K_1^* A K_2)$ is continuous as long as K_1, K_2 are operators in $\mathscr{I}_2$, and A is a bounded operator. The desired convergence of traces (3) follows from the said continuity since

$$\chi_D\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi)\chi_D = \chi_D\sqrt{g-1}\Pi(1+(g-1)\Pi)^{-1}\Pi\sqrt{g-1}\chi_D,$$

and we have the norm convergence (2) and the $\mathscr{I}_2$-convergence

$$\chi_D \Pi_n \to \chi_D \Pi.$$

2.2.1. *Convergence of finite-rank perturbations.* We now proceed to the study of convergence of finite-rank perturbations of locally trace-class projection operators. Let L_n, $L \subset L_2(E,\mu)$ be closed subspaces, and let Π_n, Π be the corresponding orthogonal projection operators. Assume we are given non-zero vectors $v^{(n)} \in L_2(E,\mu)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in L_2(E,\mu)$, and let $\widetilde{\Pi}_n, \widetilde{\Pi}$ be the operators of orthogonal projection onto, respectively, the subspaces $L_n + \mathbb{C}v^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \oplus \mathbb{C}v$.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume*

(1) $\Pi_n \to \Pi$ *in the strong operator topology as* $n \to \infty$*;*
(2) $v^{(n)} \to v$ *in* $L_2(E,\mu)$ *as* $n \to \infty$*;*
(3) $v \notin L$*.*

Then $\widetilde{\Pi}_n \to \widetilde{\Pi}$ *in the strong operator topology as* $n \to \infty$*.*

If, additionally,

$$\Pi_n \to \Pi \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

then also

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_n \to \widetilde{\Pi} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Let $\mathrm{angle}(v, H)$ stands for the angle between a vector v and a subspace H. Our assumptions imply that there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n

$$\mathrm{angle}(v_n, L_n) \geq \alpha_0.$$

Decompose

$$v^{(n)} = \beta(n)\widetilde{v}^{(n)} + \widehat{v}^{(n)},$$

where $\widetilde{v}^{(n)} \in L_n^{\perp}$, $\|\widetilde{v}^{(n)}\| = 1$, $\widehat{v}^{(n)} \in L_n$. In this case we have

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_n = \Pi_n + P_{\widetilde{v}^{(n)}},$$

where $P_{\widetilde{v}^{(n)}} \colon v \to \langle v, \widetilde{v}^{(n)}\rangle \widetilde{v}^{(n)}$, is the operator of the orthogonal projection onto the subspace $\mathbb{C}\widetilde{v}^{(n)}$.

Similarly, decompose

$$v = \beta\widetilde{v} + \widehat{v}$$

with $\widetilde{v} \in L^{\perp}$, $\|\widetilde{v}\| = 1$, $\widehat{v} \in L$, and, again, write

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_n = \Pi_n + P_{\widetilde{v}},$$

with $P_{\widetilde{v}}(v) = \langle v, \widetilde{v}\rangle \widetilde{v}$.

Our assumptions 2 and 3 imply that $\widetilde{v}^{(n)} \to \widetilde{v}$ in $L_2(E,\mu)$. It follows that $P_{\widetilde{v}^{(n)}} \to P_{\widetilde{v}}$ in the strong operator topology and also, since our operators have one-dimensional range, in $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$, which implies the proposition.

The case of perturbations of higher rank follows by induction. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary and assume we are given non-zero vectors $v_1^{(n)}, v_2^{(n)}, \dots, v_m^{(n)} \in L_2(E,\mu)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m \in L_2(E,\mu)$. Let

$$\widetilde{L}_n = L_n \oplus \mathbb{C}v_1^{(n)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_m^{(n)},$$

$$\widetilde{L} = L \oplus \mathbb{C}v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_m,$$

and let $\widetilde{\Pi}_n, \widetilde{\Pi}$ be the corresponding projection operators.

Applying Proposition 2.4 inductively, we obtain

Proposition 2.5. *Assume*

(1) $\Pi_n \to \Pi$ *in the strong operator topology as* $n \to \infty$*;*
(2) $v_i^{(n)} \to v_i$ *in* $L_2(E,\mu)$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *for any* $i = 1, \dots, m$*;*
(3) $v_k \notin L \oplus \mathbb{C}v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_{k-1}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$.

Then $\widetilde{\Pi}_n \to \widetilde{\Pi}$ *in the strong operator topology as* $n \to \infty$*. If, additionally,*

$$\Pi_n \to \Pi \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

then also

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_n \to \widetilde{\Pi} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

and, consequently, $\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\Pi}_n} \to \mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\Pi}}$ *with respect to the weak topology on* $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

2.3. **Application to infinite determinantal measures.** Take a sequence

$$\mathbb{B}^{(n)} = \mathbb{B}\left(H^{(n)}, E_0\right)$$

of infinite determinantal measures with $H^{(n)} = L^{(n)} + V^{(n)}$, where $L^{(n)}$ is, as before, the range of a projection operator $\Pi^{(n)} \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$, and $V^{(n)}$ is finite-dimensional. Note that the subset E_0 is fixed throughout.

Our aim is to give sufficient conditions for convergence of $\mathbb{B}^{(n)}$ to a limit measure $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}(H, E_0)$, $H = L + V$, the subspace L being the range of a projection operator $\Pi \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume*

(1) $\Pi^{(n)} \to \Pi$ *in* $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ *as* $n \to \infty$*;*
(2) *the subspace* $V^{(n)}$ *admits a basis* $v_1^{(n)}, \dots, v_m^{(n)}$ *and the subspace* V *admits a basis* $v_1, \dots, v_m$ *such that*

$$v_i^{(n)} \to v_i \ \text{ in } \ L_{2,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \ \text{ as } \ n \to \infty \ \text{ for all } \ i = 1, \dots, m\ .$$

Let $g\colon E \to [0,1]$ *be a positive measurable function such that*

(1) $\sqrt{1-g}\Pi^{(n)}\sqrt{1-g} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$, $\sqrt{1-g}\Pi\sqrt{1-g} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$*;*
(2) $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{1-g}\Pi^{(n)}\sqrt{1-g} = \mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{1-g}\Pi\sqrt{1-g}$*;*
(3) $\sqrt{g}V^{(n)} \subset L_2(E,\mu)$, $\sqrt{g}V \subset L_2(E,\mu)$*;*

(4) $\sqrt{g}v_i^{(n)} \to \sqrt{g}v_i$ *in* $L_2(E,\mu)$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *for all* $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Then

(1) *the subspaces* $\sqrt{g}H^{(n)}$ *and* $\sqrt{g}H$ *are closed;*
(2) *the operators* $\Pi^{(g,n)}$ *of orthogonal projection onto the subspace* $\sqrt{g}H^{(n)}$ *and the operator* Π^g *of orthogonal projection onto the subspace* $\sqrt{g}H$ *satisfy*

$$\Pi^{(g,n)} \to \Pi^g \ \text{ in } \ \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu) \ \text{ as } \ n \to \infty\,.$$

Corollary 2.7. *In the notation and under the assumptions of Proposition* 2.6*, we have*

(1) $\Psi_g \in L_1(\mathrm{Conf}(E), \mathbb{B}^{(n)})$ *for all* n, $\Psi_g \in L_1(\mathrm{Conf}(E), \mathbb{B})$*;*
(2)

$$\frac{\Psi_g \mathbb{B}^{(n)}}{\int\limits_{\mathrm{Conf}(E)} \Psi_g \, d\mathbb{B}^{(n)}} \to \frac{\Psi_g \mathbb{B}}{\int\limits_{\mathrm{Conf}(E)} \Psi_g \, d\mathbb{B}}$$

with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Indeed, the Proposition and the Corollary are immediate from the characterization of multiplicative functionals of infinite determinantal measures given in Proposition I.2.14 and Corollary I.2.19, the sufficient conditions of convergence of induced processes and finite-rank perturbations given in Propositions 2.3, 2.5, and the characterization of convergence with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ given in Proposition 2.1.

2.4. **Convergence of approximating kernels and the proof of Proposition I.1.3.** Our next aim is to show that, under certain additional assumptions, if a sequence g_n of measurable functions converges to 1, then the operators Π^{g_n} defined by (I.21) converge to Q in $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$.

Given two closed subspaces H_1, H_2 in $L_2(E,\mu)$, let $\mathrm{angle}(H_1,H_2)$ be the angle between H_1 and H_2, defined as the infimum of angles between all nonzero vectors in H_1 and H_2; recall that if one of the subspaces has finite dimension, then the infimum is achieved.

Proposition 2.8. *Let* L, V, *and* E_0 *satisfy Assumption* I.3*, and assume additionally that we have* $V \cap L_2(E,\mu) = 0$. *Let* $g_n : E \to (0,1]$ *be a sequence of positive measurable functions such that*

(1) *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *we have* $\sqrt{1-g_n}Q\sqrt{1-g_n} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$*;*
(2) *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *we have* $\sqrt{g_n}V \subset L_2(E,\mu)$*;*
(3) *there exists* $\alpha_0 > 0$ *such that for all* n *we have*

$$\mathrm{angle}(\sqrt{g_n}H, \sqrt{g_n}V) \geq \alpha_0;$$

(4) *for any bounded $B \subset E$ we have*

$$\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}, x\in E_0\cup B} g_n(x) > 0;\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in E_0\cup B} |g_n(x) - 1| = 0.$$

Then, as $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\Pi^{g_n} \to Q \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu).$$

Using the second remark after Theorem I.2.11, one can extend Proposition 2.8 also to nonnegative functions that admit zero values. Here we restrict ourselves to characteristic functions of the form $\chi_{E_0\cup B}$ with B bounded, in which case we have the following

Corollary 2.9. *Let B_n be an increasing sequence of bounded Borel sets exhausting $E \setminus E_0$. If there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for all n we have*

$$\mathrm{angle}(\chi_{E_0\cup B_n} H, \chi_{E_0\cup B_n} V) \geq \alpha_0,$$

then

$$\Pi^{E_0\cup B_n} \to Q \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu).$$

Informally, Corollary 2.9 means that, as n grows, the induced processes of our determinantal measure on subsets $\mathrm{Conf}(E; E_0 \cup B_n)$ converge to the "unperturbed" determinantal point process $\mathbb{P}_Q$.

Note that Proposition I.1.3 is an immediate corollary of Proposition 2.8 and Corollary 2.9.

Proof of Proposition 2.8.

We start by showing that, as $n \to \infty$, we have $g_n Q \to Q$ in norm.

Indeed, take $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose a bounded set B_ε in such a way that

$$\mathrm{tr}\, \chi_{E\setminus(E_0\cup B_\varepsilon)} Q \chi_{E\setminus(E_0\cup B_\varepsilon)} < \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}.$$

Since $g_n \to 1$ uniformly on $E_0 \cup B_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\chi_{E_0\cup B_\varepsilon}(g_n - 1)Q \to 0$$

in norm as $n \to \infty$. Furthermore, we have

$$\|\chi_{E\setminus(E_0\cup B_\varepsilon)} Q\| \leq \|\chi_{E\setminus(E_0\cup B_\varepsilon)} Q\|_{\mathscr{I}_2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\,.$$

Consequently, for n sufficiently big, we have:

$$\|(g_n - 1)Q\| \leq \|\chi_{E_0\cup B_\varepsilon}(g_n - 1)Q\| + \|\chi_{E\setminus(E_0\cup B_\varepsilon)} Q\| < \varepsilon\,,$$

and, since ε is arbitrary, we have, as desired, that $g_n Q \to Q$ in norm as $n \to \infty$.

In particular, we have

$$(1 + (g_n - 1)Q)^{-1} \to 1$$

in norm as $n \to \infty$.

Now, since $g_n \to 1$ uniformly on bounded sets, for any bounded Borel subset $B \subset E$, we have

$$\chi_B \sqrt{g_n} Q \to \chi_B Q \quad \text{in} \quad \mathscr{I}_2(E, \mu)$$

as $n \to \infty$. Consequently, we have

$$\chi_B \sqrt{g_n} Q \left(1 + (g_n - 1)Q\right)^{-1} Q \sqrt{g_n} \chi_B \to \chi_B Q \chi_B$$

in $\mathscr{I}_1(E, \mu)$ as $n \to \infty$, and, since B is arbitrary, we obtain

$$Q^{g_n} \to Q \quad \text{in} \quad \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu)\,.$$

We now let V_n be the orthogonal complement of $\sqrt{g_n} L$ in $\sqrt{g_n} L + \sqrt{g_n} V$, and let $\tilde{P}^{(n)}$ be the operator of orthogonal projection onto V_n.

By definition, we have

$$\Pi^{g_n} = Q^{g_n} + \tilde{P}^{(n)}\,.$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to establish that, as $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\tilde{P}^{(n)} \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu)\,,$$

to do which, since $\tilde{P}^{(n)}$ are projections onto subspaces whose dimension does not exceed that of V, it suffices to show that for any bounded set B we have $\tilde{P}^{(n)} \to 0$ in strong operator topology as $n \to \infty$.

Since the angles between subspaces $\sqrt{g_n} L$ and $\sqrt{g_n} V$ are uniformly bounded from below, it suffices to establish the strong convergence to 0 of the operators $P^{(n)}$ of orthogonal projections onto the subspaces $\sqrt{g_n} V$.

Let, therefore, $\varphi \in L_2(E, \mu)$ be supported in a bounded Borel set B; it suffices to show that $\|P^{(n)} \varphi\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. But since $V \cap L_2(E, \mu) = 0$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a bounded set $B_\varepsilon \supset B$ such that for any $\psi \in V$ we have

$$\frac{\|\chi_B \psi\|}{\|\chi_{B_\varepsilon} \psi\|} < \varepsilon^2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi\|^2 = \langle \varphi, \Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi \rangle = \\ = \langle \varphi, \chi_B \Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi \rangle \le \|\varphi\| \, \|\chi_B \Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi\| \le \\ \le \|\varphi\| \, \varepsilon \|\Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi\| \le \varepsilon \|\varphi\| \, \|\Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi\| \le \varepsilon \|\varphi\|^2\,. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\Pi^{B_\varepsilon} \varphi\| < \varepsilon \|\varphi\|$ and, since $g_n \to 1$ uniformly on B, also that $\|P^{(n)} \varphi\| < \varepsilon \|\varphi\|$ if n is sufficiently large. Since ε is arbitrary,

$$\|P^{(n)} \varphi\| \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

and the proposition is proved completely.

3. Weak compactness of families of determinantal measures

3.1. **Configurations and finite measures.** In a similar way as the Bessel point process of Tracy and Widom is the weak limit of its finite-dimensional approximations, the infinite determinantal measure $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}^{(s)}$, the sigma-finite analogue of the Bessel point process for the values of s smaller than -1, will be seen to be the scaling limit of its finite dimensional approximations, the infinite analogues of the Jacobi polynomial ensembles. In this section, we develop the formalism necessary for obtaining scaling limits of infinite determinantal measures. To do so, we will multiply our measures by finite densities, normalize and establish convergence of the resulting determinantal probability measures. Proposition 2.1 tells us that for finite determinantal measures induced by projection operators, local trace class convergence of the operators implies weak convergence of the determinantal measures (considered as measures on the space of Radon measures on the phase space). In order to prove the vanishing of the "Gaussian parameter" and to establish convergence of finite-dimensional approximations on the Pickrell set, we will however need a finer notion of convergence of probability measures on spaces of configurations: namely, under some additional assumptions we will code configurations by finite measures and determinantal measures by measures on the space of probability measures on the phase space. We proceed to precise definitions.

Let f be a nonnegative measurable function on E, set

$$\mathrm{Conf}_f(E) = \{X : \sum_{x\in X} f(x) < \infty\},$$

and introduce a map $\sigma_f : \mathrm{Conf}_f(E) \to \mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$ by the formula

$$\sigma_f(X) = \sum_{x\in X} f(x)\delta_x.$$

(where δ_x stands, of course, for the delta-measure at x).

Recall that the *intensity* $\xi\mathbb{P}$ of a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$ is a sigma-finite measure on E defined, for a bounded Borel set $B \subset E$, by the formula

$$\xi\mathbb{P}(B) = \int\limits_{\mathrm{Conf}(E)} \#_B(X)d\mathbb{P}(X).$$

In particular, for a determinantal measure $\mathbb{P}_K$ corresponding to an operator K on $L_2(E,\mu)$ admitting a continuous kernel $K(x,y)$, the intensity is, by definition, given by the formula

$$\xi\mathbb{P}_K = K(x,x)\mu.$$

By definition, we have the following

Proposition 3.1. *Let f be a nonnegative continuous function on E, and let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$. If $f \in L_1(E, \xi\mathbb{P})$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Conf}_f(E)) = 1$.*

Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, the map σ_f is $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely well-defined on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$, and the measure $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}$ is a Borel probability measure on the space $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$, that is, an element of the space $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$.

3.2. **Weak compactness and weak convergence in the space of configurations and in the space of finite measures.** We start by formulating a tightness criterion for such families of measures.

Proposition 3.2. *Let f be a nonnegative continuous function on E. Let $\{\mathbb{P}_\alpha\}$ be a family of Borel probability measures on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$ such that*

(1) *$f \in L_1(E, \xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ for all α and*

$$\sup_\alpha \int_E f d\xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha < +\infty;$$

(2) *for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $B_\varepsilon \subset E$ such that*

$$\sup_\alpha \int_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon} f d\xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha < \varepsilon.$$

Then the family $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is tight in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$.

Remark. The assumptions of Proposition 3.2 can be equivalently reformulated as follows: the measures $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ are all well-defined and the family $f\xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is tight in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, our aim is to find a compact set $C \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$ such that $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_\alpha(C) > 1 - \varepsilon$ for all α.

Let $\varphi : E \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function. Define a measurable function $\mathrm{int}_\varphi : \mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E) \to \mathbb{R}$ by the formula

$$\mathrm{int}_\varphi(\eta) = \int_E \varphi d\eta.$$

Given a Borel subset $A \subset E$, for brevity we write $\mathrm{int}_A(\eta) = \mathrm{int}_{\chi_A}(\eta)$.

The following proposition is immediate from local compactness of the space E and the weak compactness of the space of Borel probability measures on a compact metric space.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $L > 0$, $\varepsilon_n > 0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. Let $K_n \subset E$ be compact sets such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = E$. The set*

$$\{\eta \in \mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E) : \mathrm{int}_E(\eta) \le L, \mathrm{int}_{E\setminus K_n}(\eta) \le \varepsilon_n \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is compact in the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E)$.

The Prohorov Theorem together with the Chebyshev Inequality now immediately implies

Corollary 3.4. *Let* $L > 0$, $\varepsilon_n > 0$, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. *Let* $K_n \subset E$ *be compact sets such that* $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = E$. *Then the set*

$$\left\{ \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E)) : \int\limits_{\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E)} \text{int}_E(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \leq L, \right.$$
$$\left. \int\limits_{\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E)} \text{int}_{E\setminus K_n}(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \leq \varepsilon_n \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is compact in the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E))$.

Corollary 3.4 implies Proposition 3.2. First, the total mass of the measures $f\xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded, which, by the Chebyshev inequality, implies, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the existence of the constant L such that for all α we have

$$(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_\alpha(\{\eta \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E) : \eta(E) \leq L\}) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Second, tightness of the family $f\xi\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ precisely gives, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subset E$ satisfying, for all α, the inequality

$$\int\limits_{\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E)} \text{int}_{E\setminus K_\varepsilon}(\eta) d(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_\alpha(\eta) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Finally, choosing a sequence ε_n decaying fast enough and using Corollary 3.4, we conclude the proof of Proposition 3.2.

We now give sufficient conditions ensuring that convergence in the space of measures on the space of configurations implies convergence of corresponding measures on the space of finite measures.

Proposition 3.5. *Let* f *be a nonnegative continuous function on* E. *Let* $\mathbb{P}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{P}$ *be Borel probability measures on* $\text{Conf}(E)$ *such that*

(1) $\mathbb{P}_n \to \mathbb{P}$ *with respect to the weak topology on* $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(\text{Conf}(E))$ *as* $n \to \infty$;
(2) $f \in L_1(E, \xi\mathbb{P}_n)$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
(3) *the family* $f\xi\mathbb{P}_n$ *is a tight family of finite Borel measures on* E.

Then $\mathbb{P}(\text{Conf}_f(E)) = 1$ *and the measures* $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_n$ *converge to* $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}$ *weakly in* $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\text{fin}}(E))$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Proposition 3.5 easily follows from Proposition 3.2. First, we restrict ourselves to the open subset $\{x \in E : f(x) > 0\}$ which itself is a complete separable metric space with respect to the induced topology. Next observe that the total mass of the measures $f\xi\mathbb{P}_n$ is uniformly bounded, which, by the Chebyshev inequality, implies, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the existence of the constant L such that for all n we have

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left(\{X \in \mathrm{Conf}(E) : \sum_{x\in X} f(X) \le L\}\right) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Since the measures $\mathbb{P}_n$ converge to $\mathbb{P}$ weakly in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$ and the set $\{X \in \mathrm{Conf}(E) : \sum\limits_{x\in X} f(X) \le L\}$ is closed in $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{X \in \mathrm{Conf}(E) : \sum_{x\in X} f(X) \le L\}\right) > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

and, consequently, that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Conf}_f(E)) = 1$, and the measure $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}$ is well-defined.

The family $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_n$ is tight and must have a weak accumulation point $\mathbb{P}'$.

Using the weak convergence $\mathbb{P}_n \to \mathbb{P}$ in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathrm{Conf}(E))$, we now show that the finite-dimensional distributions of $\mathbb{P}'$ coincide with those of $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}$. Here we use the assumption that our function f is positive and, consequently, bounded away from zero on every bounded subset of our locally compact space E.

Indeed, let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_l : E \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions with disjoint compact supports.

By definition, the joint distribution of the random variables $\mathrm{int}_{\varphi_1}, \dots, \mathrm{int}_{\varphi_l}$ with respect to $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_n$ coincides with the joint distribution of the random variables $\#_{\varphi_1/f}, \dots, \#_{\varphi_l/f}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}_n$. As $n \to \infty$, this joint distribution converges to the joint distribution of $\#_{\varphi_1/f}, \dots, \#_{\varphi_l/f}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ which on the one hand, coincides with the the joint distribution of the random variables $\mathrm{int}_{\varphi_1}, \dots, \mathrm{int}_{\varphi_l}$ with respect to $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}$ and, on the other hand, also coincides with the joint distribution of the random variables $\mathrm{int}_{\varphi_1}, \dots, \mathrm{int}_{\varphi_l}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}'$.

By Proposition I.B.1, the finite-dimensional distributions determine a measure uniquely. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}' = (\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P},$$

and the proof is complete.

3.3. **Applications to determinantal point processes.** Let f be a nonnegative continuous function on E. If an operator $K \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu)$ induces a

determinantal measure $\mathbb{P}_K$ and satisfies $fK \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_K(\mathrm{Conf}_f(E)) = 1. \tag{4}$$

If, additionally, K is assumed to be self-adjoint, then the weaker requirement $\sqrt{f}K\sqrt{f} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$ also implies (4).

In this special case, a sufficient condition for tightness takes the following form.

Proposition 3.6. *Let f be a bounded nonnegative continuous function on E. Let $K_\alpha \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ be a family of self-adjoint positive contractions such that*

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr} \sqrt{f}K_\alpha\sqrt{f} < +\infty$$

and such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a bounded set $B_\varepsilon \subset E$ such that

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr} \chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon}\sqrt{f}K_\alpha\sqrt{f}\chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon} < \varepsilon.$$

Then the family of measures $\left\{(\sigma_f)_*\,\mathbb{P}_{K_\alpha}\right\}$ is weakly precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}\left(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)\right)$.

3.4. **Induced processes corresponding to functions assuming values in $[0,1]$.** Let $g : E \to [0,1]$ be a nonnegative Borel function, and, as before, let $\Pi \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ be an orthogonal projection operator with range L inducing a determinantal measure $\mathbb{P}_\Pi$ on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$. Since the values of g do not exceed 1, the multiplicative functional Ψ_g is automatically integrable. In this particular case Proposition I.B.3 can be reformulated as follows:

Proposition 3.7. *If $\sqrt{1-g}\Pi\sqrt{1-g} \in \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu)$ and $||(1-g)\Pi|| < 1$, then*

1. *Ψ_g is positive on a set of positive measure;*
2. *the subspace $\sqrt{g}L$ is closed, and the operator Π^g of orthogonal projection onto the subspace $\sqrt{g}L$ is locally of trace class;*
3. *we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Pi^g} = \frac{\Psi_g\mathbb{P}_\Pi}{\displaystyle\int\limits_{\mathrm{Conf}(E)} \Psi_g\, d\mathbb{P}_\Pi}.$$

Remark. Since the operator $\sqrt{1-g}\Pi$ is, by assumption, Hilbert-Schmidt, and the the values of g do not exceed 1, the condition $||(1-g)\Pi|| < 1$ is equivalent to the condition $||\sqrt{1-g}\Pi|| < 1$ and both are equivalent to the nonexistence of a function $\Phi \in L$ supported on the set $\{x \in E : g(x) = 1\}$. In particular, if the function g is strictly positive and strictly less than 1, the condition is automatically verified. Proposition 3.6 now implies

Corollary 3.8. *Let f be a bounded nonnegative continuous function on E. Under the assumptions of Proposition* 3.7*, if*

$$\operatorname{tr}\sqrt{f}\Pi\sqrt{f} < +\infty,$$

then also

$$\operatorname{tr}\sqrt{f}\Pi^g\sqrt{f} < +\infty.$$

Proof: Equivalently, we must prove that if the operator $\sqrt{f}\Pi$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, then the operator $\sqrt{f}\Pi^g$ is also Hilbert-Schmidt. Since $\Pi^g = \sqrt{g}\Pi(1+(g-1)\Pi)^{-1}\sqrt{g}$, the statement is immediate from the fact that Hilbert-Schmidt operators form an ideal.

3.5. **Tightness for families of induced processes.** We now give a sufficient condition for the tightness of families of measures of the form Π^g for fixed g. This condition will subsequently be used for establishing convergence of determinantal measures obtained as products of infinite determinantal measures and multiplicative functionals.

Let $\Pi_\alpha \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ be a family of orthogonal projection operators in $L_2(E,\mu)$. Let L_α be the range of Π_α. Let $g : E \to [0,1]$ be a Borel function such that for each α the assumptions of Proposition 3.7 are satisfied and thus the operators Π_α^g and the corresponding determinantal measures $\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^g}$ are well-defined for all α. Furthermore, let f be a nonnegative function on E such that such that for all α we have

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{f}\Pi_\alpha\sqrt{f} < +\infty \tag{5}$$

and such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a bounded Borel set $B_\varepsilon \subset E$ such that

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr}\chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon}\sqrt{f}\Pi_\alpha\sqrt{f}\chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon} < \varepsilon. \tag{6}$$

(in other words, f is such that all the assumptions of Proposition 3.6 are satisfied for all α). It follows from Corollary 3.8 that the measures $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^g}$ are also well-defined for all α.

Sufficient conditions for tightness of this family of operators are given in the following

Proposition 3.9. *In addition to the requirements, for all α, of Proposition* 3.6 *and Proposition* 3.7*, make the assumption*

$$\inf_\alpha 1 - ||(1-g)\Pi_\alpha|| > 0. \tag{7}$$

Then the family of measures $\left\{(\sigma_f)_*\,\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^g}\right\}$ is weakly precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}\left(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)\right)$.

Proof. The requirement (7) implies that the norms of the operators

$$(1+(g-1)\Pi_\alpha)^{-1}$$

are uniformly bounded in α. Recalling that $\Pi_\alpha^g = \sqrt{g}\Pi_\alpha(1+(g-1)\Pi_\alpha)^{-1}\sqrt{g}$, we obtain that (5) implies

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr} \sqrt{f}\Pi_\alpha^g\sqrt{f} < +\infty,$$

while (6) implies

$$\sup_\alpha \operatorname{tr} \chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon}\sqrt{f}\Pi_\alpha^g\sqrt{f}\chi_{E\setminus B_\varepsilon} < \varepsilon.$$

Proposition 3.9 is now immediate from Proposition 3.6.

3.6. **Tightness of families of finite-rank deformations.** We next remark that, under certain additional assumptions, tightness is preserved by taking finite-dimensional deformations of determinantal processes.

As before, we let $\Pi_\alpha \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E,\mu)$ be a family of orthogonal projection operators in $L_2(E,\mu)$. Let L_α be the range of Π_α. Let $v_{(\alpha)} \in L_2(E,\mu)$ be orthogonal to L_α, let $L_\alpha^v = L_\alpha \oplus \mathbb{C}v_{(\alpha)}$, and let Π_α^v be the corresponding orthogonal projection operator. By the Macchì-Soshnikov theorem, the operator Π_α^v induces a determinantal measure $\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^v}$ on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$. As above, we require that all the assumptions of Proposition 3.6 be satisfied for the family Π_α. The following Corollary is immediate from Proposition 3.6.

Proposition 3.10. *Assume additionally that the family of measures $f|v^{(\alpha)}|^2\mu$ is precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$. Then the family of measures $\left\{(\sigma_f)_*\,\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^v},\right\}$ is weakly precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}\left(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)\right)$.*

This proposition can be extended to perturbations of higher rank. The assumption of orthogonality of v^α to L_α is too restrictive and can be weakened to an assumption that the angle between the vector and the subspace is bounded below: indeed, in that case we can orthogonalize and apply Proposition 3.10.

We thus take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that, in addition to the family of Π_α of locally trace-class projection operators considered above, for every α we are given vectors $v_\alpha^{(1)},\dots,v_\alpha^{(m)}$ of unit length, linearly independent and independent from L_α. Set

$$L_\alpha^{v,m} = L_\alpha \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(m)},$$

and let $\Pi_\alpha^{v,m}$ be the corresponding projection operator.

By the Macchì-Soshnikov theorem, the operator $\Pi_\alpha^{v,m}$ induces a determinantal measure $\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^{v,m}}$ on $\mathrm{Conf}(E)$. As above, we require that all the assumptions of Proposition 3.6 be satisfied for the family Π_α. Here

$\mathrm{angle}(v, L)$ stand for the angle between a nonzero vector v and a closed subspace L.

Proposition 3.11. *Assume additionally that*

(1) *the family of measures $f|v_\alpha^{(k)}|^2\mu$, over all α and k, is precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E)$;*
(2) *there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $k = 1, \dots, m$ and all α we have*

$$\mathrm{angle}(v_\alpha^{(k)}, L_\alpha \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(k-1)}) \geq \delta.$$

Then the family of measures $\{(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\Pi_\alpha^{v,m}},\}$ is weakly precompact in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$.

The proof proceeds by induction on m. For $m = 1$, it suffices to apply Proposition 3.10 to the vector obtained by taking the orthogonal projection of $v_\alpha^{(1)}$ onto the orthogonal complement of L. For the induction step, similarly, we apply Proposition 3.10 to the vector obtained by taking the orthogonal projection of $v_\alpha^{(m)}$ onto the orthogonal complement of $L_\alpha \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}v_\alpha^{(m-1)}$. The proposition is proved completely.

3.7. **Convergence of finite-rank perturbations.** A sufficient condition for weak convergence of determinatal measures considered as elements of the space $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$ can be formulated as follows.

Proposition 3.12. *Let f be a nonnegative continuous function on E. Let $K_n, K \in \mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}$ be self-adjoint positive contractions such that $K_n \to K$ in $\mathscr{I}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(E, \mu)$ as $n \to \infty$. Assume additionally that*

$$\sqrt{f}K_n\sqrt{f} \to \sqrt{f}K\sqrt{f} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_1(E, \mu) \tag{8}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Then

$$(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{K_n} \to (\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_K$$

weakly in $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$ as $n \to \infty$.

Combining Proposition 3.12 with, on the one hand, Propositions 3.9, 3.11 and, on the other hand, Propositions 2.3, 2.5 and 2.6, we arrive at the following

Proposition 3.13. (1) *In the notation and under the assumptions of Proposition* 2.3*, additionally require (*8*) to hold. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{f}\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g, \Pi_n)\sqrt{f} \to \sqrt{f}\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g, \Pi)\sqrt{f}$$

in $\mathscr{I}_1(E, \mu)$, and, consequently,

$$(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi_n)} \to (\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(g,\Pi)}$$

with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$ as $n \to \infty$.

(2) *In the notation and under the assumptions of Proposition* 2.5*, additionally require (*8*) to hold. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{f}\widetilde{\Pi}_n\sqrt{f} \to \sqrt{f}\widetilde{\Pi}\sqrt{f} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu) \text{ as } n\to\infty,$$

and, consequently, $(\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\Pi}_n} \to (\sigma_f)_*\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\Pi}}$ *with respect to the weak topology on* $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$ *as* $n\to\infty$*;*

(3) *In the notation and under the assumptions of Proposition* 2.6*, additionally require (*8*) to hold. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{f}\Pi^{(g,n)}\sqrt{f} \to \sqrt{f}\Pi^{g}\sqrt{f} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}_1(E,\mu) \text{ as } n\to\infty\,.$$

and, consequently,

$$(\sigma_f)_*\frac{\Psi_g\mathbb{B}^{(n)}}{\int\Psi_g\,d\mathbb{B}^{(n)}} \to (\sigma_f)_*\frac{\Psi_g\mathbb{B}}{\int\Psi_g\,d\mathbb{B}}$$

with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathrm{fin}}(E))$ *as* $n\to\infty$*.*

Acknowledgements. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 647133 (ICHAOS)) and has also been funded by the Russian Academic Excellence Project '5-100'.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce of the United States of America, Tenth Printing, 1972.
[2] E.M. Baruch, The classical Hankel transform in the Kirillov model, arxiv:1010.5184v1.
[3] V.I. Bogachev, Measure theory. Vol. II. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2007.
[4] A.M. Borodin, Determinantal point processes, in The Oxford Handbook of Random Matrix Theory, Oxford University Press, 2011.
[5] A. Borodin, G. Olshanski, Infinite random matrices and ergodic measures. Comm. Math. Phys. 223 (2001), no. 1, 87–123.
[6] A.M. Borodin, E.M. Rains, Eynard-Mehta theorem, Schur process, and their pfaffian analogs. J. Stat. Phys. 121 (2005), 291–317.
[7] P. Bourgade, A. Nikeghbali, A. Rouault, Ewens Measures on Compact Groups and Hypergeometric Kernels, Séminaire de Probabilités XLIII, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2011, pp 351-377.
[8] A.I. Bufetov, Infinite Determinantal Measures and The Ergodic Decomposition of Infinite Pickrell Measures I. Submitted to Russian Mathematical Surveys.
[9] A.I. Bufetov, Infinite Determinantal Measures and The Ergodic Decomposition of Infinite Pickrell Measures III. Submitted to Russian Mathematical Surveys.
[10] A.I. Bufetov, Ergodic decomposition for measures quasi-invariant under Borel actions of inductively compact groups, arXiv:1105.0664, May 2011, to appear in Matematicheskii Sbornik .

[11] A.I. Bufetov, Finiteness of Ergodic Unitarily Invariant Measures on Spaces of Infinite Matrices, arXiv:1108.2737, August 2011, to appear in Annales de l'Institut Fourier.
[12] A.I. Bufetov, Multiplicative functionals of determinantal processes, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 67 (2012), no. 1 (403), 177–178; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 67 (2012), no. 1, 181–182.
[13] A. Bufetov, Infinite determinantal measures, Electronic Research Announcements in the Mathematical Sciences, 20 (2013), pp. 8 – 20.
[14] D.J.Daley, D. Vere-Jones, An introduction to the theory of point processes, vol.I-II, Springer Verlag 2008.
[15] J. Faraut, Analyse sur les groupes de Lie: une introduction, Calvage et Mounet 2006.
[16] J. Faraut, Analysis on Lie Groups, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
[17] S. Ghobber, Ph. Jaming, Strong annihilating pairs for the Fourier-Bessel transform. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 377 (2011), 501–515.
[18] S. Ghobber, Ph. Jaming, Uncertainty principles for integral operators, arxiv:1206.1195v1
[19] J.B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, B. Virág, Determinantal processes and independence. Probab. Surv. 3 (2006), 206–229.
[20] Hua Loo Keng, Harmonic Analysis of Functions of Several Complex Variables in the Classical Domains, Science Press Peking 1958, Russian translation Moscow Izd.Inostr. lit., 1959, English translation (from the Russian) AMS 1963.
[21] A. Kolmogoroff, Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, Springer Verlag, 1933.
[22] A. Lenard, States of classical statistical mechanical systems of infinitely many particles. I. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 59 (1975), no. 3, 219–239.
[23] R. Lyons, Determinantal probability measures. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. No. 98 (2003), 167–212.
[24] R. Lyons, J. Steif, Stationary determinantal processes: phase multiplicity, Bernoullicity, entropy, and domination. Duke Math. J. 120 (2003), no. 3, 515–575.
[25] E. Lytvynov, Fermion and boson random point processes as particle distributions of infinite free Fermi and Bose gases of finite density. Rev. Math. Phys. 14 (2002), no. 10, 1073–1098.
[26] O. Macchi, The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. Advances in Appl. Probability, 7 (1975), 83–122.
[27] Yu.A. Neretin, Hua-type integrals over unitary groups and over projective limits of unitary groups. Duke Math. J. 114 (2002), no. 2, 239–266.
[28] G. Olshanski, The quasi-invariance property for the Gamma kernel determinantal measure. Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 3, 2305–2350.
[29] G. Olshanski, Unitary representations of infinite-dimensional pairs (G, K) and the formalism of R. Howe, In: Representation of Lie Groups and Related Topics, Adv. Stud. Contemp. Math., 7, Gordon and Breach, NY, 1990, pp. 269–463, online at `http://www.iitp.ru/upload/userpage/52/HoweForm.pdf`
[30] G. Olshanski, Unitary representations of infinite-dimensional classical groups (Russian), D.Sci Thesis, Institute of Geography of the Russian Academy of Sciences; online at `http://www.iitp.ru/upload/userpage/52/Olshanski_thesis.pdf`
[31] G. Olshanski, A. Vershik, Ergodic unitarily invariant measures on the space of infinite Hermitian matrices. In: Contemporary mathematical physics, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 175, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996, pp. 137–175.

[32] D. Pickrell, Mackey analysis of infinite classical motion groups. Pacific J. Math. 150 (1991), no. 1, 139–166.
[33] D. Pickrell, Separable representations of automorphism groups of infinite symmetric spaces, J. Funct. Anal. 90 (1990), 1–26.
[34] D. Pickrell, Measures on infinite-dimensional Grassmann manifolds, J. Funct. Anal. 70 (1987), 323–356.
[35] M. Rabaoui, Asymptotic harmonic analysis on the space of square complex matrices. J. Lie Theory 18 (2008), no. 3, 645–670.
[36] M. Rabaoui, A Bochner type theorem for inductive limits of Gelfand pairs. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 58 (2008), no. 5, 1551–1573.
[37] M. Reed, B. Simon, Methods of modern mathematical physics. vol.I-IV. Second edition. Academic Press, Inc. New York, 1980.
[38] T. Shirai, Y. Takahashi, Random point fields associated with fermion, boson and other statistics. In: Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 39, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2004, 345–354.
[39] T. Shirai, Y. Takahashi, Random point fields associated with certain Fredholm determinants. I. Fermion, Poisson and boson point processes. J. Funct. Anal. 205 (2003), no. 2, 414–463.
[40] T. Shirai, Y. Takahashi, Random point fields associated with certain Fredholm determinants. II. Fermion shifts and their ergodic and Gibbs properties. Ann. Probab. 31 (2003), no. 3, 1533–1564.
[41] B. Simon, Trace class ideals, AMS, 2011.
[42] A. Soshnikov, Determinantal random point fields. (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 55 (2000), no. 5(335), 107–160; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 55 (2000), no. 5, 923–975.
[43] G. Szegö, Orthogonal polynomials, AMS 1969.
[44] C. A. Tracy, H. Widom, Level spacing distributions and the Bessel kernel. Comm. Math. Phys. 161, no. 2 (1994), 289–309.
[45] A.M. Vershik, A description of invariant measures for actions of certain infinite-dimensional groups. (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 218 (1974), 749–752.

AIX-MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ, CENTRALE MARSEILLE, CNRS, I2M

UMR 7373, RUE F. JOLIOT CURIE , MARSEILLE, FRANCE

STEKLOV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, MOSCOW,

RUSSIA